

8/20/70

Dear Gris,

In the haste and confusion, I forgot in writing you earlier that I had already done some of this in an addition to the introduction, where I say, specifically, what the book will prove and what I believe.

Now that I am writing the last chapter, that is, am dealing with the material I've forced out by suit, I had planned to do what I did with WHITEWASH, ask questions that are largely self-answering. However, after reading your letter of the 13th, I now believe this should be in the form of short, encapsulating sentences, and that I will now do.

If I can only get time!

Yesterday I was in court again, this time to win a summary judgement from the defaulting Department of Justice. Incredible! I can't give you a rational explanation.

The government is so up tight about this I would not be a bit surprised if they come up with a conspiracy allegation or charge before the book can come out.

Again, thanks.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Griscom Morgan

Rt. 1, Box 275

Yellow Springs,

Ohio 45387

August 18, 1970

Dear Hal:

I keep coming back in response to your letters -- fast. For the time is indeed short for your to get published, and I feel that the point I have been trying to make with you has not been fully made. I liked your last letter very much and it is very encouraging. The importance of getting your work published right away -- the King book at least -- is great.

Now the thing I feel the need of communicating is this: Garrison's forward to your O. in N.O. was not helpful to your book because Garrison never did the task I am urging should be done -- in forward or last chapter or in brief article for the media. That is what you did brilliantly and in a brief time on the Phil Donahue show in Dayton and what I attempted to do in a number of articles I could not get printed. You defined this that I am asking for in writing that you must not summarize the case in the beginning because the "finky New York intellectuals would die at the thought without first having seen the proof and would go no further." That is precisely what is wrong with Garrison's forward, excellent though it is as a summary of the issues. It is a literary effort and not one of forensic science. Garrison has cheapened his words by much statement out of relation to the inescapable evidence. All could be and was disputed. You have the evidence to vignette the case with indisputable evidence -- or the forward writer has it, in your material. I would not ask for a big name for the forward writer. I ask that the writer be a man of real competence who can do the job. I feel that Jay Schwartz might be the man. He, you may remember, wrote the sound evaluation of the Warren Report for the Journal of the American Academy of Forensic Science. He came up to the standard of a sound scientist's report or evaluation. You have been criticized as "shrill". For you have drilled in over and over the enormity of the crime of the Establishment. The forward writer needs to leave this element out completely to counterbalance this characteristic. And he needs to make the issue crystal clear in terms of facts and not of exhortation.

Yes, your concluding chapter and the case for the Ray evidence can do much in this way. What I do hope for is an evidence summation that defines the over-all picture. The literature has been repeatedly and soundly criticized as lacking a rationale that could make the events meaningful, within a small enough compass that one could see it without being lost in the vast complex of evidence or exposition. These are essentially simple things that have happened, the complexity being the massing of evidence to show that so and so was in on the conspiracy and that such and such was the objective. I have a copy of a painting by August Pettankoffen, a water color, that is so true to life that with a few deft strokes, bits of paint rightly placed, the man he depicts comes to life. It is not at all a cartoon or a caricature, but the personality revealed faithfully and lovingly. The simplicity is the work of the great artist. I want to see the evidence used this way in the conclusion or forward.

Could Wecht -- Dr. Cyril Wecht -- help you get the right forensic scientist to do the forward, or do it himself? Perhaps if he thought

Jay Schwartz right he could ask him for you.

Well, these are some thoughts to burden you with.

Best wishes,

*Gris*

Griscom Morgan